

**To:** Koch, Kristine[Koch.Kristine@epa.gov]; Sheldrake, Sean[sheldrake.sean@epa.gov]; Muza, Richard[Muza.Richard@epa.gov]; Grandinetti, Cami[Grandinetti.Cami@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Yamamoto, Deb[Yamamoto.Deb@epa.gov]  
**From:** Cohen, Lori  
**Sent:** Fri 12/5/2014 7:07:59 PM  
**Subject:** RE: PH - draft agenda for Exec meeting  
RA talking points Dec 8 2014 PH Execs mtg.docx

Thanks Sean and Kristine for your comments, I added most in and some other points as well. Please take a last look...

Will finalize later today.

Lori

**From:** Koch, Kristine  
**Sent:** Friday, December 05, 2014 7:41 AM  
**To:** Cohen, Lori; Sheldrake, Sean; Muza, Richard; Grandinetti, Cami  
**Cc:** Yamamoto, Deb  
**Subject:** RE: PH - draft agenda for Exec meeting

Lori - -Here are my thoughts on some differences between LDW and PH. (you may want to spell out acronyms). Let me know if you want to discuss.

- The hydrodynamics of the two rivers differ which make environmental conditions for cleanup differ. LWR is a much bigger river with higher flow rates. LDW has lower flows and greater deposition than the LWR which makes the LDW more conducive to MNR and EMNR remedies.
- PH has more hot spots than LDW. The hot spots are not all PCBs: there are also hot spots of dioxin/furans, DDX, PAHs.
- PH has several highly contaminated groundwater plumes that are impacting the river.
- LDWG was comprised of four parties while LWG is comprised of 10 parties. At PH, EPA also has a MOU with the State, 6 Tribal governments, and 3 resource agencies (one state and two federal). The more stakeholders involved means the more voices with differing opinions that need to be considered.
- LDW had a joint CERCLA/MTCA order where PH is strictly CERCLA. LDW had to balance two laws in developing a cleanup option.

Kristine Koch  
Remedial Project Manager  
USEPA, Office of Environmental Cleanup

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region 10  
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, M/S ECL-115  
Seattle, Washington 98101-3140

(206)553-6705  
(206)553-0124 (fax)  
1-800-424-4372 extension 6705 (M-F, 8-4 Pacific Time, only)

**From:** Cohen, Lori  
**Sent:** Monday, December 01, 2014 4:22 PM  
**To:** Koch, Kristine; Sheldrake, Sean; Muza, Richard; Grandinetti, Cami  
**Cc:** Yamamoto, Deb  
**Subject:** PH - draft agenda for Exec meeting

All-

Based on our meeting with LWG, I put together this draft agenda for the Execs meeting next Monday based on what we heard from the LWG on Nov 19.

Draft Agenda:

Welcome and Introductions	Mayor Hales and Dennis McLerran
---------------------------	---------------------------------

EPA Updates on Portland Harbor Project

Planned Milestones/ Modifications to FS Process Dennis McLerran

Sediment Site Cleanups – Common Elements	Dennis McLerran/ Jim Woolford
--	-------------------------------

State Update on Source Control	Dick Pedersen
--------------------------------	---------------

Roundtable Discussion	All
-----------------------	-----

Topics/ Timeframe for Next Meeting	Dennis McLerran
------------------------------------	-----------------

**Any comments/ additional topics we should have Dennis/Jim cover?** Please note the following;

The Planned Milestones topic will pretty much be our target dates and that we are working with LWG to modify the process to be more efficient.

The Sed Cleanup topic will be to get at the question they raised about “what does Dennis mean when he likens PH to Duwamish”. The ROD will be out by the time of the meeting so we can give him so high level points such as the following – note, this is a first cut, need your ideas here:

All sediment sites, including the Duwamish, are similar in that:

- Our policy is to address ongoing sources of contamination before initiating cleanup of contaminated sediments. We’re doing that at Duwamish, we are doing this at Portland Harbor as we have at our other Superfund sites with contaminated sediments. State plays a key role in this and we value this important partnership.
- We generally select a combination of technologies, such as dredging and capping, rather than just one technology, to address sediment contamination. Typically enhanced natural recovery and natural recovery are also part of the remedy.
- Remedies can include on site disposal or off site disposal of contaminated sediments - consider the tradeoffs.
- We tailor cleanup plans to address the specific needs at each site.

There are some aspects that are more unique to Duwamish:

- We have worked with all parties involved with the cleanup to clean up the most contaminated areas before issuing the ROD. This has been done at many, but not all Superfund cleanups.
- Heard from key parties that they wanted a final ROD. Therefore ROD has Remedial Action Goals (RALs that determine where active cleanup is required) and long term cleanup goals. Long term goals for surface water and sediments are included in the ROD; parties will be required to monitor to see if these long term goals can be met and if not we would consider if additional work needed under CERCLA (under a separate decision ) or if those standards should be waived in the future.
- Washington state has stringent cleanup laws, like their sediment management standards, which are an important factor in our selection of cleanup levels at Washington sites.
- Carbon amendment pilot – for application in ENR areas.

Timeframe for next meeting? Suggestions?

Thanks all,

Lori